

On the unique factorization theorem for formal power series

By

Hajime NISHIMURA

(Received Aug. 25, 1967)

Let $R\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the formal power series ring in a finite number of independent variables x_1, \dots, x_n with coefficient ring R . It is known that even if R is a unique factorization domain $R\{x_i\}$ is not always so.¹⁾

We shall denote the following condition for a ring²⁾ R by (*):

(*) $R\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a unique factorization domain, for any n (finite).

It is noted that (*) is satisfied by a regular semi-local integral domain R , which follows from the fact that a regular local ring is a unique factorization domain. This naturally raises the question whether the unique factorization theorem still holds for the case of infinitely many variables, provided coefficient domain R satisfies (*). The question is only partially answered below (Theorem 1), where notion of formal power series is taken in a wider sense than the usual one.

As for the usual formal power series, what we show is that if R is a Krull ring then $R\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots\}$ is also a Krull ring, which is an application of Theorem 1.

The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to Prof. M. Nagata for his valuable suggestion and encouragement.

1. Let R be a ring, X be a set of indeterminates, $\text{card. } X = \aleph^*$. As usual, by a X -monomial $(x)^e$ of degree n ($n=0, 1, 2, \dots$) we mean

1) See P. Samuel, *Anneaux factoriels*, Publicações da Sociedade de Matemática de São Paulo, 1963, pp. 58-63.

2) A ring in this note always means a commutative ring with 1.

$$(x)^e = \prod_{x \in X} x^{e(x)}; \quad e(x): \text{integer} \geq 0, \quad \sum_{x \in X} e(x) = n.$$

Let $M(X)$ be the set of all X -monomials. We note that $\text{card. } M(X) = \text{card. } X = \aleph^*$, if \aleph^* is not less than \aleph_0 (the cardinality of a countable set). For each element $(a_e) \in R^{M(X)}$, we consider the formal sum

$$(1) \quad f = \sum a_e(x)^e; \quad a_e \in R, \quad (x)^e \in M(X).$$

Let \aleph be a cardinal number $\geq \aleph_0$. We call (1) an \aleph -series with respect to X over R , if $\text{card. } \{(x)^e \mid a_e \neq 0\} \leq \aleph$.

The set $R\{X\}_\aleph$ of all these \aleph -series forms a ring by the obvious operations. This we see readily even when $\aleph < \aleph^*$, taking account of the fact that then for any element f in $R\{X\}_\aleph$ there is a subset Y of X such that $f \in R\{Y\}_\aleph$ and $\text{card. } Y = \aleph$.

We denote by f_n ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) the homogeneous part of degree n of an \aleph -series f . The subring $R\{X\}$ of $R\{X\}_\aleph$ consisting of those \aleph -series f such that f_n is a finite sum (a polynomial) for every n is nothing but the usual formal power series ring; that is, the (X) -adic completion of the polynomial ring $R[X]$, where (X) is the ideal of $R[X]$ generated by the set X . We note that although merely $R\{X\}_\aleph = R\{X\}$ if X is a finite set, otherwise necessarily $R\{X\}_\aleph \neq R\{X\}$.³⁾

The above notations will be fixed throughout this note.

Lemma 1. *If R is an integral domain, then $R\{X\}_\aleph$ is an integral domain, and so is $R\{X\}$. An element $f \in R\{X\}_\aleph$ (or $\in R\{X\}$) is a unit if and only if the constant term of f is a unit in R .*

Proof. We may make X a well-ordered set. We order X -monomials by their degree, and then for X -monomials of the same degree we order lexicographically. Namely: $\prod x^{e(x)} < \prod x^{e'(x)}$, if either (i) $\sum e(x) < \sum e'(x)$ or (ii) $\sum e(x) = \sum e'(x)$ and $e(y) > e'(y)$ where y is the first variable such that $e(y) \neq e'(y)$. Thus we make $M(X)$ a well-ordered set in such a way that if m_1, m_2, m_3 , and m_4 are four X -monomials with $m_1 \leq m_2$ and $m_3 \leq m_4$ then we have $m_1 \cdot m_3 \leq m_2 \cdot m_4$.

Let f and g be non-zero elements of $R\{X\}_\aleph$, and let $a_m \cdot m$

3) If $\aleph^* \geq \aleph_0$, the \aleph -series $\sum_{x \in Y} x$ of degree 1, where Y is a subset of X with $\text{card. } Y = \aleph_0$, is not in $R\{X\}$.

and $b_{m'} \cdot m'$ ($m, m' \in M(X)$; $a_m, b_{m'} \in R$) be the first monomials which appear with non-zero coefficients in f and g respectively. Then, clearly, $a_m \cdot b_{m'} \cdot m \cdot m'$ is the first monomial which actually occurs in $f \cdot g$. Thus $f \cdot g \neq 0$, and the first assertion is proved.

The second assertion is proved also by the same way as in the case of a finite number of variables; by virtue of the ordering of $M(X)$. q.e.d.

Lemma 2. *Let R be an integral domain and let Ω be the field of quotients of $R\{X\}$, then we have*

$$R\{X\} = R\{X\}_{\aleph} \cap \Omega.$$

Proof. Assume that there is an element f in $R\{X\}_{\aleph} \cap \Omega$ which is not contained in $R\{X\}$. Then f is an \aleph -series and we have

$$(2) \quad f \cdot F = G, \quad \text{with } F, G \in R\{X\}.$$

Let f_n, F_n , and G_n be the homogeneous parts of degree n of f, F , and G respectively. Let F_q be the leading form of F ; that is, the homogeneous part $\neq 0$ of F of the least degree. Since $f \notin R\{X\}$, there exists an integer n for which f_n involves infinitely many variables actually. Of all these integers let n be the least. From (2),

$$(3) \quad G_{n+q} = f_n \cdot F_q + \dots + f_0 \cdot F_{n+q}.$$

Both sides of (3), except for $f_n \cdot F_q$, involve only a finite number of variables. While $f_n \cdot F_q \neq 0$ and involves infinitely many variables actually among terms with non-zero coefficients, which is a contradiction. q.e.d.

2. We consider a well-ordering of X , and fix it henceforth. Let α be the ordinal number of the ordered set X . For each ordinal number $\xi < \alpha$, we denote by x_ξ the element y of X such that ξ is the ordinal number of $\{x \in X \mid x < y\}$; so that for each $\xi \leq \alpha$ the set $X_\xi = \{x_\nu \mid \nu < \xi\}$ has the ordinal number ξ .

For ξ and η with $\eta < \xi \leq \alpha$ and for any cardinal number \aleph' not less than \aleph , we have the ring homomorphism, denoted by ρ_η^ξ ,

$$(4) \quad \rho_\eta^\xi : R\{X_\xi\}_{\aleph} \rightarrow R\{X_\eta\}_{\aleph'};$$

by taking the residue class of each element of $R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$ modulo the ideal generated by $\{x_\nu \mid \nu \leq \nu < \xi\}$. Then the following lemma follows readily from Lemma 1.

Lemma 3. *An element of $R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$ is a unit if and only if its image by ρ_η^ξ is a unit.*

Lemma 4. *Assume that $\aleph \geq \aleph^*$. Let a transfinite sequence $(f_\xi)_{\xi < \alpha}$ be such that :*

$$(5) \quad \begin{cases} f_\xi \in R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph, \\ \text{and } \rho_\eta^\xi f_\xi \sim f_\eta \quad \text{if } \eta < \xi. \end{cases} \quad 4)$$

Then, there exists a $g \in R\{X\}_\aleph$ such that $\rho_\xi^\alpha g \sim f_\xi$ for any $\xi < \alpha$.

Proof. We shall define g_ν for every $\nu (\leq \alpha)$, by transfinite induction, such that

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} g_\nu \in R\{X_\nu\}_\aleph, \\ g_\nu \sim f_\nu \quad \text{if } \nu < \alpha, \\ \text{and } \rho_\mu^\nu g_\nu = g_\mu \quad \text{if } \mu < \nu \leq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Set $g_1 = f_1$. Assume g_ν has been defined for every ν with $\nu < \xi$, so that (6) is satisfied.

Case 1. $\xi = \alpha$ and α is an isolated number.

Define $g_\xi = g_{\xi-1}$.

Case 2. ξ is an isolated number and $\xi < \alpha$.

As $\rho_{\xi-1}^\xi f_\xi \sim f_{\xi-1} \sim g_{\xi-1}$, we have $\rho_{\xi-1}^\xi (h_\xi \cdot f_\xi) = g_{\xi-1}$; where h_ξ is a unit in $R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$ (Lemma 3). Define $g_\xi = h_\xi \cdot f_\xi$.

Case 3. $\xi = \alpha$ and α is a limit number.

For any given X_ξ -monomial $(x)^\epsilon$, there exists a $\nu (< \xi)$ such that $(x)^\epsilon$ is already a X_ν -monomial, and the coefficient of $(x)^\epsilon$ in g_ν is independent of the choice of ν . Therefore we can consider $\lim_{\nu < \xi} g_\nu \in R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$. Define $g_\xi = \lim_{\nu < \xi} g_\nu$.

Case 4. ξ is a limit number and $\xi < \alpha$.

As $\rho_\nu^\xi f_\xi \sim f_\nu \sim g_\nu$ for any $\nu < \xi$, we have $\rho_\nu^\xi (h_\nu \cdot f_\xi) = g_\nu$; where h_ν is

4) $f \sim g$ means f and g are associates with each other.

a unit in $R\{X_\nu\}_\aleph$. As it is easily seen that $\rho_\mu^\nu h_\nu = h_\mu$, we can consider $\lim_{\nu < \xi} h_\nu = h_\xi \in R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$. By Lemma 3, h_ξ is a unit in $R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$. Define $g_\xi = h_\xi \cdot f_\xi$. q.e.d.

Theorem 1.⁵⁾ *If a ring R satisfies the condition (*), then $R\{X\}_\aleph$ is a unique factorization domain.*

Proof. We use transfinite induction on \aleph^* (= the cardinality of X). When X is a finite set, the assertion is trivial. Let $\aleph^* \geq \aleph_0$. Assume the assertion holds for variables of less cardinality.

Let α be the least ordinal number which has cardinality \aleph^* . We reorder X so that the ordinal type of the ordered set X is α . With respect to this ordering, let x_ξ, X_ξ , and ρ_η^ξ be as above. Then, for every $\xi < \alpha$, the cardinality of $X_\xi = \{x_\nu \mid \nu < \xi\}$ is less than \aleph^* ; so that $R\{X_\xi\}_\aleph$ is a unique factorization domain by the induction assumption. We note that α is a limit number; for otherwise α is an isolated number (not finite), and therefore $\alpha - 1$ would also have cardinality \aleph^* .

Furthermore, we may assume $\aleph \geq \aleph^*$. Indeed, if $\aleph < \aleph^*$, then, letting Y run over all subsets of X such that $\text{card. } Y = \aleph$, we have $R\{X\}_\aleph = \cup R\{Y\}_\aleph$. The assertion in the case where $\aleph < \aleph^*$ follows from the facts that $R\{Y\}_\aleph$ is a unique factorization domain, that any finite number of elements of $R\{X\}_\aleph$ can be contained in a suitable $R\{Y\}_\aleph$ at the same time, and that an element of $R\{X\}_\aleph$ is irreducible if and only if it is so in a $R\{Y\}_\aleph$.

First we shall show that :

UF 1. *every element $f \neq 0$ of $R\{X\}_\aleph$ is expressed as a product of a finite number of irreducible elements.*

Write $\rho_\nu^\alpha f = f_\nu$. We consider a sufficiently large ν ($< \alpha$) such that $f_\nu \neq 0$. In the unique factorization domain $R\{X_\nu\}_\aleph$, let the factorization of f_ν into irreducible factors be

$$(7) \quad f_\nu = h_\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m(\nu)} p_{\nu,i}^{e(\nu,i)};$$

5) The case where $\aleph \geq \aleph^*$ has been obtained by E. D. Cashwell and C. J. Everett, *Formal power series*, Pacific J. Math. **13**, 1963, pp. 45-64; D. Deckard, M. A. Thesis, Rice University, 1961; D. Deckard and L. K. Durst, *Unique factorization*, Pacific J. Math. **16**, 1966 pp. 239-242.

where h_ν is a unit, $p_{\nu,i}$ is an irreducible non-unit in $R\{X_\nu\}_\mathbb{K}$ such that $p_{\nu,i} \not\sim p_{\nu,j}$ for $i \neq j$. The number of non-unit factors in (7) is denoted by $d(\nu)$: $d(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^{m(\nu)} e(\nu, i)$. If $\nu < \mu < \alpha$, then $f_\mu \neq 0$, and we get another factorization of f_ν by going down from μ :

$$(8) \quad f_\nu = \rho_\nu^\mu f_\mu = (\rho_\nu^\mu h_\mu) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m(\mu)} (\rho_\nu^\mu p_{\mu,i})^{e(\mu,i)}.$$

In (8) we see that each factor $\rho_\nu^\mu p_{\mu,i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq m(\mu)$) is a non-unit and $\rho_\nu^\mu h_\mu$ is a unit in $R\{X_\nu\}_\mathbb{K}$, by Lemma 3.

Since of all factorization of f_ν the factorization into irreducible factors has the largest number of non-unit factors, it follows from (7) and (8) that $d(\nu)$ is monotone decreasing with ν . Hence, there exists a ν_1 such that if $\nu_1 < \nu$, $d(\nu)$ is a constant: $=d$. When $d(\nu) = d$, each factor $\rho_\nu^\mu p_{\mu,i}$ in (8) ($\nu < \mu < \alpha$, $1 \leq i \leq m(\mu)$) must be irreducible in $R\{X_\nu\}_\mathbb{K}$.

Consider μ and ν such that $\nu_1 < \nu < \mu$. Comparing once more (7) with (8), we see that $m(\nu) \leq m(\mu)$; since $m(\nu)$ is the number of distinct irreducible components of f_ν . This implies that $m(\nu)$ is monotone increasing with ν if $\nu_1 < \nu$. Moreover, $m(\nu)$ is upperly bounded since $\sum_{i=1}^{m(\nu)} e(\nu, i) = d$. Hence, there exists a ν_0 such that if $\nu_0 < \nu$, $m(\nu)$ is a constant: $=m$; and therefore if $\nu_0 < \nu$ $e(\nu, i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) must also be a constant: $=e_i$. Thus we get if $\nu_0 < \nu$,

$$(9) \quad \begin{cases} f_\nu = h_\nu \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m p_{\nu,i}^{e_i} & (\text{factorization into irreducible} \\ & \text{factors in } R\{X_\nu\}_\mathbb{K}) \\ \rho_\nu^\mu p_{\mu,i} \sim p_{\nu,i} & (\nu_0 < \nu < \mu < \alpha, 1 \leq i \leq m). \end{cases}$$

By using Lemma 4, we can find $q_i \in R\{X\}_\mathbb{K}$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) such that $\rho_\nu^\alpha q_i \sim p_{\nu,i}$ ($\nu_0 < \nu < \alpha$, $1 \leq i \leq m$). Let h'_ν be the unit in $R\{X_\nu\}_\mathbb{K}$ such that $f_\nu = h'_\nu \cdot \rho_\nu^\alpha (\prod_1^m q_i^{e_i})$. As $\rho_\nu^\alpha h'_\nu = h'_\nu$ and α is a limit number, we can consider $\lim_{\nu_0 < \nu < \alpha} h'_\nu = h' \in R\{X\}_\mathbb{K}$; where h' is a unit, by Lemma 3.

Thus we get a factorization of f in $R\{X\}_\mathbb{K}$:

$$(10) \quad f = h' \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m q_i^{e_i}.$$

It is clear that every q_i is a non-unit, by Lemma 3. That every q_i is moreover irreducible follows from the fact that if q_i were factorized into two non-units, then, by going down to ν , $(q_i)_\nu \sim p_{\nu,i}$ would be factorized into two non-units. This completes the proof of UF 1.

Remark. The following is also a consequence of our argument above.

If f is irreducible, then f_ν is irreducible for sufficiently large $\nu (< \alpha)$.

(The converse is also true as we have seen above.)

Indeed, assume the contrary, suppose that f is irreducible and that there are ν arbitrarily large such that f_ν is reducible. Then we can find ν such that f_ν is reducible and ν is larger than ν_0 defined in (9). Therefore, in (9), $\sum_1^m e_i$ must be > 1 . Thus, we have $f = h' \cdot \prod_1^m q_i^{e_i}$, $\sum_1^m e_i > 1$; by (10). As each q_i ($1 \leq i \leq m$) has been a non-unit, we obtain a contradiction.

Finally, we shall show that:

UF 2. *if $p|f \cdot g$ with $p, f, g \in R\{X\}_\mathfrak{K}$ and if p is irreducible, then either $p|f$ or $p|g$.*

Indeed, let $\nu (< \alpha)$ be sufficiently large so that $(f \cdot g)_\nu \neq 0$, and that p_ν is irreducible (by Remark above). From $p|f \cdot g$ we have either $p_\nu|f_\nu$ or $p_\nu|g_\nu$. Therefore, we see that either the upper limit of the set $\{\nu | \nu < \alpha, f_\nu \text{ is divisible by } p_\nu\}$ or that of the set $\{\nu | \nu < \alpha, g_\nu \text{ is divisible by } p_\nu\}$ is equal to α . For otherwise, since α is a limit number, there would be a ν sufficiently large such that neither f_ν nor g_ν is divisible by p_ν .

We consider the case where the upper limit of the former is α . Then f_ν must be divisible by p_ν also for every $\nu (< \alpha)$; since if $\nu < \mu$ and $p_\mu|f_\mu$, then $p_\nu|f_\nu$. Write $f_\nu = p_\nu \cdot f'_\nu$, then $(f'_\nu)_{\nu < \alpha}$ satisfies the condition $\rho_\nu^\mu f'_\mu = f'_\nu$; and therefore we can consider $\lim_{\nu < \alpha} f'_\nu = f'$ in $R\{X\}_\mathfrak{K}$. Thus we conclude $f = p \cdot f'$. This completes the proof of UF 2, and therefore of the theorem.

3. We remark that the question whether $R\{X\}_{\aleph}$ in Theorem 1 is replaced by $R\{X\}$, namely every q_i in (10) can be chosen as an usual formal power series when f is so, remains unsolved.

Now we shall consider $R\{X\}$ under a mild condition that R is a Krull ring. We recall⁶⁾ that an integral domain R is a Krull ring if and only if the following three conditions are satisfied:

KR 1. $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring for any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of R of height 1.

KR 2a. Every principal ideal of R has only a finite number of prime divisors \mathfrak{p} such that $\text{height } \mathfrak{p} = 1$.

KR 2b. Letting \mathfrak{p} run over prime ideals of height 1 in R , we have $R = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Theorem 2. *If R is a Krull ring, then so is $R\{X\}$.*

Proof. Let K and Ω be the fields of quotients of R and $R\{X\}$ respectively. Let \aleph be any cardinal number $\geq \aleph_0$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R of height 1. Since $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring (KR 1.); using Theorem 1, we see that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\aleph}$ is a unique factorization domain, and therefore a Krull ring. Similarly, we see that $K\{X\}_{\aleph}$ is a Krull ring. Since, by Lemma 2, $K\{X\}$ is expressed as an intersection of $K\{X\}_{\aleph}$ and a field; $K\{X\}$ is also a Krull ring.⁷⁾

Now, let V be the set consisting of those discrete valuation rings v of the field Ω , such that v is either equal to one of $v_{\mathfrak{q}}$ or equal to one of $v_{\mathfrak{q}_1}$ of the following types:

$$(i) \quad v_{\mathfrak{q}} = K\{X\}_{\mathfrak{q}} \cap \Omega,$$

where \mathfrak{q} is a prime ideal of $K\{X\}$ of height 1.

$$(ii) \quad v_{\mathfrak{q}_1} = [R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\aleph}]_{\mathfrak{q}_1} \cap \Omega,$$

where \mathfrak{p} is a prime ideal of R of height 1, and \mathfrak{q}_1 is a prime ideal of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\aleph}$ of height 1 such that \mathfrak{q}_1 contains an element whose leading form has all coefficients in $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

6) As for the theory of Krull rings see, e.g., M. Nagata, *Local rings*, John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 115-118.

7) See Theorem (33.6) and (33.7), pp. 116-117, *ibid.*

Owing to the criterion for a Krull ring,⁸⁾ we have only to prove that

- 1) if an element f of $R\{X\}$ is not zero, then there are only a finite number of v in V such that f is a non-unit in v ;
- 2) $R\{X\} = \bigcap_{v \in V} v$.

Proof of 1). By virtue of KR 2a for $K\{X\}$, almost all prime ideals q of height 1 in $K\{X\}$ do not contain the given f . (“almost all” means all but a finite number.) Whence we see that there are only a finite number of v_q of type (i) in which f is a non-unit.

By virtue of KR 2a for R , there are only a finite number of common prime divisors p of height 1 for all the coefficients of the leading form of the given f . For such a common prime divisor p , almost all prime ideals q_i of height 1 in $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$ do not contain f ; by KR 2a for $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$. While for a remaining prime ideal p of R of height 1, in $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$ no prime ideal q_i of height 1 contains both f and an element whose leading form has all coefficients in pR_p . (Note that a prime ideal of $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$ of height 1 is principal.) Thus we see that there are only a finite number of v_{q_i} of type (ii) in which f is a non-unit.

Proof of 2). Clearly, $R\{X\} \subseteq \bigcap_{v \in V} v$. Conversely, let $f \in \bigcap_{v \in V} v$. Since $\bigcap_q v_q = K\{X\}$ by KR 2b for $K\{X\}$, we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in V} v = \left(\bigcap_q v_q \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{p, q_i} v_{q_i} \right) \subseteq K\{X\} \cap \left(\bigcap_{p, q_i} [R_p\{X\}_\kappa]_{q_i} \right).$$

As an element of $K\{X\}$, f can be written

$$(11) \quad f = \sum a_e(x)^e, \quad a_e \in K \quad (\text{formal power series}).$$

We fix p for a while. Then as an element of the field of quotients of $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$, f is also written

$$(12) \quad f = G/F; \quad F, G \in R_p\{X\}_\kappa, \quad F \neq 0.$$

Since $R_p\{X\}_\kappa$ is a unique factorization domain, we may assume that $(F, G) = 1$ in (12); so that F and G in (12) are uniquely

8) See Theorem (33.6), p. 116, *ibid.*

determined by f except for unit factors. Let F_q be the leading form of F . Let \mathfrak{p} be the prime element of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. (We note that \mathfrak{p} is also a prime element of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$.) Then, $\mathfrak{p} \nmid F_q$ in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$. For otherwise a minimal prime divisor \mathfrak{q}_1 of F in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$ would satisfy the condition in (ii) above; and $F \in \mathfrak{q}_1$, $G \notin \mathfrak{q}_1$, so that $[R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}]_{\mathfrak{q}_1}$ would not contain $f=G/F$.

We shall show that every coefficient a_e in (11) must be in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Assume the contrary. Of all the homogeneous parts of series (11) one of whose coefficients is not in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, let f_n be of the least degree. As f is a formal power series and therefore f_n is a polynomial with coefficients in K , we can write

$$(13) \quad f_n = f'_n / \mathfrak{p}^k; \quad k: \text{integer} > 0, \quad f'_n \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}, \quad (f'_n, \mathfrak{p}) = 1 \text{ in } R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}.$$

From $f \cdot F = G$, we get

$$G_{n+q} = f_n \cdot F_q + \cdots + f_0 \cdot F_{n+q},$$

and so it follows that $f_n \cdot F_q \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$. Therefore, by (13), we have $\mathfrak{p}^k \mid f'_n \cdot F_q$ in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$; which contradicts to the fact that $\mathfrak{p} \nmid f'_n$, $\mathfrak{p} \nmid F_q$, and \mathfrak{p} is irreducible in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}\{X\}_{\mathfrak{K}}$.

Thus, we have shown that in (11) every $a_e \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, where \mathfrak{p} may be an arbitrary prime ideal of height 1 in R . Since $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}} R_{\mathfrak{p}} = R$ by KR 2b for R , it follows from this that every coefficient a_e in (11) must be in R , therefore $f \in R\{X\}$ as desired. This completes the proof of 2) and of the theorem.